REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 26-53 are pending in the application. Claims 1-25 were withdrawn and then cancelled. Claims 26-53 are rejected by the Examiner.

Amendment of Independent Claim 26

Applicant has amended claim 26. The claim amendments are supported by reference characters 4a, 4b, 4c as shown in Figure 4 and ¶¶ [0028] and [0044], for example. The amendment clarifies that page data is transmitted from a content provider system to the browser

No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

1. There is no prima facie case for obviousness for claims 26-34 because neither Slotznick nor Rosenchein teaches an application interface on the browser and a method for determining from the content page a service application.

The establishment of a prima facie case for obviousness requires that all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP §2143.03. Also, all of the words in the claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385; 165 USPQ 442 (CCPA 1970).

A prima facie case for obviousness has not been established for claim 26 since neither Slotznick (U.S. Pat. 5,983,200) nor Rosenchein (U.S. Pat. 6,341,306) teaches all of the elements recited in independent claim 26. In this regard, the Action has not given du consideration to detailed claim language. For example, elements that are missing from the prior art include: (1) an application interface on a browser; and (2) [...a method for] data received by the remote computer system being determined according to the content page present on a

browser. Since these recited claim limitations are missing, a prima facie case for obviousness has not been established and the claim is allowable, for at least these reasons, as well as additional reasons described below arising from the amendment of claim 26.

A. The claimed element "Application interface on a browser" is not taught in Slotznick or Rosenchein.

Claim 26 states:

> "A method for context personal browsing...wherein the browser companion agent determines contextual relevance by coupling to a browser on the client computer system via an <u>application interface</u>". (emphasis added).

The term "application interface" is defined in the specification as an "application program interface" (Application, ¶ [0069]). The application program interface (API) is connected or coupled to the browser (Application, Figure 4). This API operates on the browser to provide functions, such as, filling in forms. (See Application, Figure 10). The API operates on data and code that is transmitted from the remote computer system to the agent, which then interfaces with the browser. (Applicant, ¶ [0120].) Therefore, the API is a recited element of the claimed method needed to manipulate the browser.

Slotznick does not teach an application interface for a browser. The focus of Slotznick is to schedule tasks on a central computer using input data. (Slotznick, Column 1, lines 14-19; Figure 2). The output of Slotznick is not to a browser, but to various devices that are involved with the processing of merchandise. (Column 15, lines 49-60; Column 16, lines 30-42). There is nothing in Slotznick that teaches the "sending the data or code to the browser companion agent for use by a service module" as claimed by the Applicant. (See Application, Claim 26). As mentioned in previous response, Stotznick does not mention or suggest the word "browser" or any browser-based technology.

Rosenchein also does not teach an application interface for a browser. Rosenchein describes a system where the user clicks on a word, the word is transmitted to a server, the server processes the word, and returns a list of results that are relevant to a word. (Rosenchein, Figure 2). The output data of Rosenchein is sent to a Client 52 which displays the text. (Rosenchein, Column 7, line 6; Column 11, line 59-Column 12, line 6). Rosenchein does not describe an API that operates on the <u>existing</u> browser session, rather it shows a <u>separate</u> display window application being opened, which is disclosed to be a separate application, not the current browser session. (Rosenchein, Figure 2).

Since neither Slotznick nor Rosenchein teach the recited element of the claim, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established for claim 26. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26.

Since claims 27-34 are dependent on the base claim 26, a prima facie case of obviousness has not be established in view of the arguments presented. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 27-34.

B. <u>The claimed element "A method for determining a content page a service application" is not taught in Slotznick or Rosenchein.</u>

The relevant part of claim 26 states:

> "A method for context personal browsing... comprising: the data received bv the remote computer system being determined according to the content page present on a browser of the client computer system; <u>determining from the page data</u> at least one set of data or executable code that corresponds to a service module...". (emphasis added)."

The term "content page" is defined in the specification as the page that is present on the browser (Application, ¶ [0066]-¶[0068]). The method of determining data or executable code that corresponds to a service module requires reading the content page on the browser and

determining the list of services that are available on the server. (Application, ¶ [0068], stating "the Tracker object looks at list of services on a remote machine"). Therefore claim 26 requires that the browser data and code be transmitted to the remote computer system.

Slotznick does not teach the equivalent method of processing of the browser "content page". The input device connected to the CPU 34 of Slotznick is a kiosk 52, personal computer 54, telephone 56, or interactive television 58 collectively referred to as "stand-alone devices". (Slotznick, Figure 3; Column 10, line 18 to Column 11, line 21). In a representative example of the input device, Slotznick describes the input as "'logs on' to the device" and "first screen that might appear to the user on the device's video screen or monitor". (Slotznick, column 18, lines 1-8). That screen is not disclosed to be a browser, and Slotznick does not otherwise describe a browser-based application that determines a service module. Therefore Slotznick fails to teach the recited element of processing the content page on a browser.

Rosenchein does not teach the method of processing a browser's "content page". The input to Rosenschein is text selected from a web page by "designating a word". (Rosenchein, Column 1, lines 61-64). Rosenchein expressly teaches away from the claimed processing of a content page on a browser by stating that there must be a manual step: "In general, the server does not have access to the body of the text [on the users screen] prior to the designation of the word". (Rosenchein, Column 2, lines 1-2). When the user selects the word it alone is transmitted to the server. (Rosenchein, Column 2, lines 17-19). This manual operation is further reinforced by Figure 2 where text is selected on the screen. (Rosenchein, Figure 2). Rosenchein does not describe the automated processing of a content page. To emphasize, what is being claimed, applicant has amended claim 26 to recite that service module data or code is "automatically" determined, and not manually determined. Therefore, Rosenchein fails to teach the element of processing the content on a browser page as stated in claim 26, and thus a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established for at least this reason.

Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26.

C. The claim amendments further clarify the three recited computer system elements, which are not found in Slotznick

Applicant has amended claim 26 with the language:

"determining contextual relevance according to changes in the content pages on the browser; and wherein the content page on the browser of the client computer system is received from a content provider system that is not the same as the remote system"

This amendment has support in the specification and is intended to clarify that the Applicant is claiming an interaction between three separate systems: (1) client computer system, (2) the content provider for the content page or the client system, and (3) the remote computer system that receives data from the client computer system. (See Application, Figure 4, reference characters 4a, 4b, 4c). The interaction between the systems is triggered by changes in the content pages on the browser. (Application, ¶[0028]).

In contrast, the design of Slotznick is focused on one central computing system. (See Slotznick, Figure 3). The remote devices as illustrated in Slotznick perform the function of sending simple data input strings to the central computer. (Slotznick, Figure 3, reference character 46). Therefore Slotznick does not teach the elements as specified in claim 26.

Likewise, Rosenchein does not teach the three separate systems interacting when a web page changes automatically. In Rosenchein, the user designates and manually "clicks" on a word. (Rosenchein, Column 2, lines 13-16; see also Rosenchein, claim 1). Claim 26 is therefore distinguishable from this reference.

Since Slotznick and Rosenchein do not teach all of the elements of claim 26, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26 since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

D. Claims 27-34 are allowable as dependent claims on claim 26.

Since claim 26 is allowable for the aforementioned reason, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established for claims 27-34 are dependent on the base claim 26. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 27-34.

2. There is no prima facie case for obviousness for dependent claims 36-40 because neither Slotznick, Rosenchein, nor Perkowski teaches an application interface on the browser and a method for determining from the content page of a service application..

Perkowski (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0158792) describes a system where UPC (Universal Product Codes) are input into a computer (preferably by an optical scanner) and the system returns a list of web links related to the UPC code. (Perkowski, Abstract; also Figures 3A1, 3A2). The interface that is relevant to browsers is shown in Figure 3C. (Perkowski, Figure 3C). The browser interface in Perkowski is configured in a series of "check box" type functions which are "hot linked" to a particular HTML encoded document. (Perkowski, ¶ [0117]). The browser in Perkowski makes no mention of the execution of a Browser Helper Object (BHO).

The Browser Helper Object (BHO) is well known in the arts and is defined in the specification by U.S. Pat. No. 5,903,728 and U.S. Pat. No. 6,266,058. (Application, ¶ [0058]). As defined in the '058 , "A browser helper object is any Windows COM object, which can be thought of as a special kind of Windows program, that gets started by the browser when the browser starts". (U.S. Pat. No. 6,266,058, Column 4, lines 63-66).

Since Perkowski lacks a BHO as defined by the specification or a functional equivalent

to a BHO, Perkowski cannot be combined with Slotznick and Rosenchein to create a prima facie case of obviousness for claim 36 in view of the arguments made for claim 26, *supra*.
Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 36.

Since claims 37-48 and 51-53 are dependent on the base claim 36, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established in view of the arguments presented. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of rejection of dependent claims 37-48 and 51-53.

3. There is no prima facie case for obviousness for Independent claim 41 and dependent claims 42-48 and 51-53 because neither Slotznick, Rosenchein nor Perkowski teaches a method for transferring a service module for context personalized between two computer systems.

A prima facie case of obviousness has not been established for claim 41, since each and every element is not taught by Slotznick, Rosenchein, and Perkowski.

The Action states that Slotznick teaches "...sending a service module for context personalized browsing...". Slotznick does not teach the transfer of a service module, rather, Slotznick is directed towards the processing of tasks on a central computer.

The Action further states that paragraph 119 of Perkowski teaches, "A tracking component for tracking the domain of a page on a browser...". The Perkowski reference describes a configuration of "IPD" servers (e.g., Internet Product Directory) to support the barcoding applications for Perkowski. The IPD servers provide product information relevant to UPC codes. (Perkowski, ¶ [0105]). The IPD servers do not communicate domain and page data. Therefore Perkowski does not describe a tracking component.

Also, the Action states that paragraphs 16 and 23 of Perkowski teach, "A data component for holding data related to one of more service modules". Services modules are defined in the Application as a software application executed in a browser. The browser interface in Perkowski is configured in a series of "check box" type functions which are "hot

linked" to a particular HTML encoded document. (Perkowski, ¶ [0117]). The browser in Perkowski makes no mention of the execution of a service module in the Application.

Likewise, the Action cites to the program "Flyswat" (Rosenchein, Column 1, lines 39-44) as teaching the element "...Wherein the browser companion agent determines contextual relevance by coupling to a browser on the client computer system via an application interface". The Flyswat reference is non-enabling because it does not describe how a browser companion agent (or the equivalent thereof) determines contextual relevance, rather the reference simply says it is a sidebar on a browser window.

Since Slotznick, Perkowski, and Rosenchein fail to teach all of the recited elements in claim 41, a prima facie case of obviousness has not established for the rejection of claim 41. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 41.

Since claims 42-48 and 51-53 are dependent on the base claim 41, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established in view of the arguments presented. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of rejection of dependent claims 42-48 and 51-53.

Nothing herein should be deemed as a disclaimer or surrender of any rights, an acquiescence in any rejection, or a waiver of any arguments that might have been raised but were not raised herein or otherwise in the prosecution of this application. Applicant reserves all rights and subject matter with respect to claims being or to be pursued in this or a related application.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that in view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, the application is in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Applicant understands that no fees are due at this time. However, if necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, additional fees, or underpayments, or to credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 50-1001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4-10-2008

J. Curtis Edmondson
Registration No. 57,027
Ganz Law, P.C.
P. O. Box 2200
Hillsboro, Oregon 97123
Telephone: (503) 844-9009
Facsimile: (503) 296-2172
email: mail@ganzlaw.com